



INDIAN MIGRATIONS,

AS EVIDENCED BY LANGUAGE:

COMPRISING

THE HURON-CHEROKEE STOCK: THE DAKOTA STOCK: THE ALGONKINS:
THE CHAHTA-MUSKOKI STOCK: THE MOUNDBUILDERS:
THE IBERIANS.

By HORATIO HALE, M. A.

*A Paper read at a Meeting of the American Association for the Advance-
ment of Science, held at Montreal, in August, 1882.*

Reprinted from the "American Antiquarian" for January and April, 1883.

CHICAGO:
JAMESON & MORSE, PRINTERS, 162-164 CLARK ST.
1883.

INDIAN MIGRATIONS, AS EVIDENCED BY LANGUAGE.

The only satisfactory evidence of the affiliation or direct relationship of two communities, apart from authentic historical records, is to be found in their speech. When the languages of two nations or tribes show a close resemblance in grammar and vocabulary, we may at once infer a common descent, if not of the whole, at least of some portion of the two communities. This is a rule which, so far as experience goes, admits of no exception. The cases which are frequently referred to, of negroes in the West Indies and the Southern States who speak English, French, Spanish and Dutch, and of Indians in Canada and Mexico who speak French and Spanish, are not exceptions, but may, in fact, be reckoned among the strongest evidences in proof of the rule; because we know historically that, in every one of these cases, there has been not merely an intimate connection of these negroes and Indians with people of the nations whose languages they have adopted, but a large infusion of the blood of those nations. It may be affirmed with confidence that no contrary example can be shown. If an explorer should find in the heart of Africa, or in some newly discovered island of Australasia, a black and woolly-haired people whose language showed in its numerals, its pronouns, its names for near relationships, and the conjugation of its verbs, indubitable traces of resemblance to the Arabic tongue, we should infer without hesitation not merely that this people had been at some time visited by Arabs, but that an Arabian people had been in some way intermingled among them for generations, and had left, along with their language, a large infusion of Arab blood. If, besides the resemblance of speech, there should be a resemblance of physical traits,—if the people not only spoke a language similar to the Arabic, but had the stature, features, complexion and hair of Arabs,—we should entertain no doubt that they were, in the main, of Arabian descent.

When the evidence of language has satisfied us that two communities are thus connected, our next inquiry relates to the nature of the connection. Is one of them derived from the other, and if so, which was the ancestral stock? Or is this connection that of brotherhood, and do they deduce their origin

and their languages, like the Latin nations of southern Europe, from a common ancestry? The clues which will lead us to the solution of these questions must again be sought in the evidence of language, and generally in minute and careful comparison of words and grammatical forms; but this evidence may be reinforced by that of tradition, which, when it exists, will usually be found to correspond with that of language. The Hindoo tradition, which makes the Aryans enter India from the northwest in prehistoric times, and gradually overrun the northern portion of the peninsula, accords strictly, as every scholar knows, with the deductions drawn from the study of the languages of that region. So, too, the Polynesian race, which peopled the groups of the Pacific Ocean, from the Sandwich Islands on the north to New Zealand on the south, and from Easter Island in the east to the Depeyster Group, four thousand miles distant in the west, is traced back, by the joint evidence of language and tradition, to a starting point or center of migration in the Samoan or Navigator Islands, near the western limit of this vast region. Though the emigration which peopled some of the eastern groups must have taken place at least three thousand years ago, the fact of its occurrence is unquestionable. This instance is made the more notable by the circumstance that neither the source nor the direction of the migration is such as merely geographical considerations would have led us to conjecture. New Zealand and the Sandwich Islands are by far the largest groups of Polynesia. When first known to Europeans, each of these groups contained a much greater population than the mother group of Samoa. From either of them the usual course of winds and currents would carry a fleet of canoes to the other islands of Polynesia far more readily than from the Navigator Islands, whence the voyager must make his way to the eastern groups directly in the teeth of the trade-winds. These considerations, however, have had no weight in the minds of ethnologists against the decisive test of language, reinforced, as it is, by the evidence of native tradition.

In studying the languages of this continent we are naturally led to inquire how far we can apply these tests of language and tradition in tracing the connection and migration of the Indian tribes. It is evident at once that in making such inquiries we are confined in each case to tribes speaking languages of the same stock. For though there is, unquestionably, a certain general congruity of structure among Indian languages of different stocks, sufficient to strengthen the common opinion, derived from physical and mental resemblances, which classes the people who speak them in one race, yet this con-

gruity does not comprise that distinct and specific similarity in words and forms which is required as a proof of direct affiliation. In the present state of philological science we must, therefore, as has been said, limit our inquiries to the tribes of each distinct linguistic family, including, however, such as may possibly have been formed by the intermixture of tribes of different stocks.

The group of kindred tribes to which, in pursuing these inquiries, my attention was first directed, was that which is commonly known as the Huron-Iroquois family, but which I should be rather inclined, for reasons that will be hereafter stated, to denominate the Huron-Cherokee stock. A peculiar interest attaches to the aboriginal nations of this kinship. Surrounded as they usually were, in various parts of the continent, by tribes of different lineage,—Algonkin, Dakota, Choctaw, and others,—they maintained everywhere a certain pre-eminence, and manifested a force of will and a capacity for political organization which placed them at the head of the Indian communities in the whole region extending from Mexico to the Arctic circle. Their languages show, in their elaborate mechanism, as well as in their fulness of expression and grasp of thought, the evidence of the mental capacity of those who speak them. Scholars who admire the inflections of the Greek and Sanscrit verb, with their expressive force and clearness, will not be less impressed with the ingenious structure of the verb in Iroquois. It comprises nine tenses, three moods, the active and passive voices, and at least twenty of those forms which in the Semitic grammars are styled conjugations. The very names of these forms will suffice to give evidence of the care and minuteness with which the framers of this remarkable language have endeavored to express every shade of meaning. We have the diminutive and augmentative forms, the cis-locative and trans-locative, the duplicative, reiterative, motional, causative, progressive, attributive, frequentative, and many others. I am aware that some European and American scholars, shocked to find their own mother-tongues inferior in this respect not only to the Sanscrit and Greek, but even to the languages of some uncivilized tribes, have adopted the view that inflections are a proof of imperfection and a relic of barbarism. They apparently forget that if they vindicate in this way a superiority for their native idiom over the Greek and the Iroquois, they reduce it at the same time, not only below the Mandchu and Polynesian tongues, but beneath even the poverty-stricken speech of the Chinese.*

* In support of the opinion expressed in the text, I may cite two very eminent authorities. Professor Max Müller, who acquired a knowledge of the Iroquois language from a Mohawk undergraduate at Oxford (now Dr. Oronhyatekha, of London, Ont.), remarks in a

The constant tradition of the Iroquois represents their ancestors as emigrants from the region north of the great lakes, where they dwelt in early times with their Huron brethren. This tradition is recorded, with much particularity, by Cadwallader Colden, Surveyor General of New York, who in the early part of the last century composed his well-known "History of the Five Nations." It is told in a somewhat different form by David Cusick, the Tuscarora historian, in his "Sketches of Ancient History of the Six Nations;" and it is repeated by Mr. L. H. Morgan in his now classical work, "The League of the Iroquois," for which he procured his information chiefly among the Senecas. Finally, as we learn from the narrative of the Wyandot Indian, Peter Clarke, in his book entitled "Origin and Traditional History of the Wyandotts," the belief of the Hurons accords in this respect with that of the Iroquois. Both point alike to the country immediately north of the St. Lawrence, and especially to that portion of it lying east of Lake Ontario, as the early home of the Huron-Iroquois nations.

How far does the evidence of language, which is the final test, agree with that of tradition? To answer this question we have to inquire which language, the Huron or the Iroquois, bears marks of being oldest in form, and nearest to the mother language,—or, in other words, to the original Huron-Iroquois speech. Though we know nothing directly of this speech, yet, when we have several sister-tongues of any stock, we can always reconstruct, with more or less completeness, the original language from which they were derived; and we know, as a general rule, that among these sister-tongues, the one which is most complete in its form and in its phonology is likely to be nearest in structure, as well as in the residence of those who speak it, to this mother speech. Thus, if history told us nothing on the subject, we should still infer that, among what are termed the Latin nations of Europe, the Italians were nearest to the mother people,—and, in like manner, that the original home of the Aryans was not among the Teutons or the Celts, but somewhere between the speakers of the Sanscrit and of the Greek languages.

Our materials for a comparison of the Huron and the Iroquois are not as full as could be desired. They are, however,

letter to the author: "To my mind, the structure of such a language as the Mohawk is quite sufficient evidence that those who worked out such a work of art were powerful reasoners and accurate classifiers." Not less emphatic is the judgment expressed by Professor Whitney, in his admirable work on the "Life and Growth of Language." Speaking generally of the structure of American languages, but in terms specially applicable to those of the Huron-Cherokee stock, he observes: "Of course there are infinite possibilities of expressiveness in such a structure; and it would only need that some native-American Greek race should arise, to fill it full of thought and fancy, and put it to the uses of a noble literature, and it would be rightly admired as rich and flexible, perhaps beyond anything else that the world knew." See also the excellent works of the distinguished missionary author, the Rev. J. A. Cuoq, of Montreal, on the Iroquois and Algonquin languages, in which abundant examples are given of the richness and power of those tongues.

quite sufficient to show that the Huron represents the older form of their common speech. A single point of phonology may be deemed decisive of this question. The Iroquois dialects, as is well known, have no labial letter. Neither *m*, *b*, or *p* is found in any Iroquois word, and the language is spoken without closure of the lips. But in the Huron speech, or rather (as there were at least two distinct dialects of this speech), in that form of it which is spoken by the Wyandots (or Wendat), and which bears the marks of being the oldest form of this language, the sound of the *m* is frequently heard. A comparison of the words in which this sound occurs with the corresponding words of the Iroquois dialects, shows beyond question that this sound once existed in the mother-tongue from which these words were derived, and has been lost in the Iroquois. We find that this Huron *m* has at least five distinct sounds or combinations of sounds to represent it in the Iroquois. By this fact we are reminded of the similar fate which has befallen in English the Teutonic guttural *ch* (as heard in the German words *Buch*, *Loch*, *lachen*, &c.), which, after surviving for a time in the Anglo-Saxon language, has disappeared from the English speech. In some English words, as we know, its place has been taken by the palatal *k*; *Buch* has become *book*, *machen* is changed to *make*, and so on. In other cases it is converted to *tch*; the German *pech* is our *pitch*, the German *dach* is our *thatch*. In still other cases it is changed to *f*, as in *laugh* from *lachen*, *soft* from *sacht*; while in many more instances it has been dropped altogether as a distinct element, its former existence being merely indicated by its influence on the sound of the preceding vowel,—as in *thought* from the German *dachte*, *high* from the German *hoch*, *might* from the German *macht*, and so on, in numerous words which will occur to every student of etymology. In close accordance with this treatment of the German guttural by the English organs of speech is that of the Huron labial by the Iroquois. In many instances the Huron *m* becomes *w* in Iroquois. Thus *tementaye*, “two days,” becomes in Onondaga *tewentage*; *yameh̄on*, “dead,” is in Cayuga *yaweh̄on*; *skatamendj̄awe*, “one hundred,” becomes in Mohawk *askatawanīwi*. Sometimes the sound of the nasal *ñ* (resembling the French nasal in *bon*), is introduced before the *w*; thus the Huron *oma*, “to-day,” becomes *oñwa* in Mohawk; the pronominal prefix *homa*, “their,” becomes *hoñwa*. Frequently this latter combination is further reinforced by the hard palatal element *k* or *g*, after the nasal; thus the Huron *rume*, “man,” becomes in Mohawk *ruñgwe* or *ruñkwe*; “he loves us,” which is *somandoroñkwa* in Huron, becomes *soñkwanoroñkwa* in

Mohawk. Sometimes the *m* is replaced by a nasal followed by an aspirate; thus *somâa*, "thou alone," becomes *soñhâa*. The Huron *mema*, "tobacco," is singularly transformed. The first *m* becomes in Iroquois *oy*, and the second is represented by the combination *ñkw*, thus giving us the Mohawk *oyeñkwa*. In these instances the Huron words are undoubtedly the original forms, from which the Iroquois words are derived. Some other evidences of a similar kind, which show that the Huron is the elder speech, will be hereafter adduced, though they may perhaps hardly be deemed necessary.

Our next inquiry relates to the course which the emigration pursued after crossing the St. Lawrence. The Iroquois proper (omitting for the present the Tuscaroras), are divided into five tribes or "nations," speaking dialects so dissimilar that the missionaries have been obliged to treat them as distinct languages. The difference between the Mohawk and the Seneca tongues is at least as great as that which exists between the Spanish and Portuguese languages. These five tribes, when they were first known to Europeans, occupied the northern portion of what is now the State of New York, their territory extending from the Hudson river on the east to the Genesee on the west. The easternmost tribe was the Mohawk. Directly west of them lay the Oneidas, followed in regular order by the Onondagas, Cayugas and Senecas. Of these tribes the Seneca was much the largest, comprising nearly as many people as all the rest together. The Onondagas were the central, and, to a certain extent, the ruling nation of the league. If we had not the evidence of language and tradition to guide us, the natural presumption would be that either the Senecas or the Onondagas were the parent tribe, of which the others were offshoots. But tradition and language alike award this position to the Mohawks. This nation was styled in council the "eldest brother" of the Iroquois family. The native historian Cusick distinctly affirms that the other tribes broke off from the Mohawk people, one after another, and as each became a separate nation, "its language was altered." The words thus quoted express briefly, but accurately, the necessary result of several generations of separate existence. It remains to show how the test of language confirms the tradition, and proves beyond question that the course of migration flowed from east to west. The following comparative list is derived from vocabularies, all of which have been recently taken down by the writer from the lips of members of the various tribes. The Wyandot words are placed first, as being probably nearest to the original forms in the parent language. Then follow the five Iroquois tribes, in regular order, from east to west; and

finally the Tuscarora, a sister, rather than a daughter, of the Mohawk, closes the list. In this comparison, certain inflections of the verb "to love" have been selected, as showing how the course of derivation is disclosed both by the changes of sounds and by the grammatical variations.*

It would not be easy to find a more striking and beautiful example than the annexed list furnishes of the operation of a well-known linguistic law. I refer to the law of "phonetic decay," as it is called by Professor Max Müller, who has described its origin and effect, with his usual clearness of style and fulness of illustration, in the Second Series of his "Lectures on Language." He there shows how words, either by lapse of time or change of locality, are apt to undergo a course of reduction and contraction, due to the desire of economizing effort in speaking. The words are softened and worn away, like stones undergoing what geologists call the process of degradation: Thus, to adopt and extend some of his examples, the German *Habicht* becomes the Anglo-Saxon *hafoc*, and the English *hawk*; the German *sprechen* becomes the Anglo-Saxon *sprecan*, and the English *speak*; the German *haupt* becomes the Anglo-Saxon *heafod*, and the English *head*. So, drawing our examples from words of another origin, the Latin *scutarius* becomes in old French *escuyer*, in English *squire*; the Latin *capitulum* becomes in French *chapitre*, in English *chapter*, and so on. Referring to our table of Huron-Iroquois derivatives, it will be noticed that the Wyandot *heskwandorônkwa* is softened in Mohawk to *chtshisewanorônkwa* by a uniform process of what may be termed deliquescence. The initial aspirate of the Wyandot word is dropped (or perhaps changed in position); the first *k* is softened to *tsh*, precisely as the name of the great orator, which in Latin was *Kikero*, becomes *Tshitshero* in Italian pronunciation; the sibilant *s* changes its place, and the hard sound of *nd* becomes simply *n*. The still softer Oneida utterance contracts the first three syllables of the Mohawk (*ch-tshi-sc*) to *ets*, and changes the trilled *r* to the liquid *l*, giving us *etswanolonkwa*. The Onondaga, pursuing the same process, changes the initial *ets* to the still softer *hesc*, and drops the *r* altogether, still retaining, however,—though with a slight change,—the vowels which preceded and followed it, and thus converts the word to *hesewanônkwa*. The Cayuga, following in due order, contracts these two vowels into one, and converts the initial *hesc* into *ses*, but introduces, by a slight reversion to

*In the orthography followed in this paper the consonants have generally the same sounds as in English, and the vowels the same sounds as in Italian and German. The *j* is sounded as in French, or like the English *z* in *azure*. The German guttural *ch* is represented by *kh* or (when softened) by *gh*. The French nasal *n* is expressed by the Spanish *ñ*. The short *u* (as it is called) in *but* is denoted by *u*. The emphatic syllable of a word is indicated by an acute accent, or, when the vowel is long, by the usual horizontal mark above it, as *û*, *ê*, &c.

	WYANDOT.	MOHAWK.	ONEIDA.	ONONDAGA.	CAYUGA.	SENECA.	TUSCARORA.
I love thee	<i>yondor óñkwa</i>	<i>konor óñkwa</i>	<i>konolóñkwa</i>	<i>konoíñkwa</i>	<i>konóñhkwa</i>	<i>konóñkwa</i>	<i>kenoróñkwa</i>
I love him	<i>endor óñkwa</i>	<i>rinor óñkwa</i>	<i>ínolóñkwa</i>	<i>henoíñkwa</i>	<i>henóñhkwa</i>	<i>henóñkwa</i>	<i>kianoróñkwa</i>
He loves thee	<i>ejandor óñkwa</i>	<i>hianor óñkwa</i>	<i>hianolóñkwa</i>	<i>hianoíñkwa</i>	<i>yanoñhkwa</i>	<i>yanoñkwa</i>	<i>yasanoróñkwa</i>
He loves us	<i>somandor óñkwa</i>	<i>soñkwanor óñkwa</i>	<i>soñkwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>soñkwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>soñkwanóñhkwa</i>	<i>sonkwanóñkwa</i>	<i>yéñkinoróñkwa</i>
He loves you	<i>heskwandor óñkwa</i>	<i>ehshisewanor óñkwa</i>	<i>etswanolóñkwa</i>	<i>hesewanolóñkwa</i>	<i>seswanóñhkwa</i>	<i>seswanóñkwa</i>	<i>yets hánoróñkwa</i>
He loves them	<i>hayondor óñkwa</i>	<i>sakonor óñkwa</i>	<i>sakanolóñkwa</i>	<i>sakonoíñkwa</i>	<i>sakonóñhkwa</i>	<i>sakonóñkwa</i>	<i>kayenoróñkwa</i>
We love them	<i>hewandor óñkwa</i>	<i>yakinor óñkwa</i>	<i>yakinolóñkwa</i>	<i>akinoíñkwa</i>	<i>akinóñhkwa</i>	<i>ets hínóñkwa</i>	<i>yekínoróñkwa</i>
Ye love me	<i>skwandor óñkwa</i>	<i>takwanor óñkwa</i>	<i>takwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>skwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>skwanóñhkwa</i>	<i>skwanóñkwa</i>	<i>skwanoróñkwa</i>
Ye love him	<i>heskwandor óñkwa</i>	<i>ehshisewanor óñkwa</i>	<i>etswanolóñkwa</i>	<i>hesewanolóñkwa</i>	<i>seswanóñhkwa</i>	<i>seswanóñkwa</i>	<i>yets hínoróñkwa</i>
They love thee	<i>hesandor óñkwa</i>	<i>yesanor óñkwa</i>	<i>yewanolóñkwa</i>	<i>esanoíñkwa</i>	<i>kaesanóñhkwa</i>	<i>esanóñkwa</i>	<i>kayesanoróñkwa</i>
They love him	<i>homandor óñkwa</i>	<i>roñwanor óñkwa</i>	<i>lonwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>hoñwanolóñkwa</i>	<i>hoñwanóñhkwa</i>	<i>onwanóñkwa</i>	<i>kayenoróñkwa</i>
They love us	<i>hamandor óñkwa</i>	<i>yonkinor óñkwa</i>	<i>yonkinolóñkwa</i>	<i>yonkinoíñkwa</i>	<i>onkinóñhkwa</i>	<i>onkinóñkwa</i>	<i>yonkinoróñkwa</i>
They love them	<i>homatindor óñkwa</i>	<i>sakotínor óñkwa</i>	<i>sakotínolóñkwa</i>	<i>haya konolóñkwa</i>	<i>onwtatínóñhkwa</i>	<i>onwanóñkwa</i>	<i>kayenoróñkwa</i>

harshness of utterance, an aspirate after the following nasal, giving us *seswanōñhkwa*. And, finally, the Senecas of the extreme west drop that unnecessary aspirate, and in lieu of the difficult Wyandot word *heskwandorōñkwa*, and the seven-syllabled Mohawk term, *chtshiscwanorōñkwa*, give us a word of four syllables, *seswanōñkwa*, quite as easily spoken and at least as euphonious as its English translation, "he loves you." No person accustomed to the study of linguistics will doubt, after carefully examining this comparative list, that the Mohawk presents the earliest form of the Iroquois speech, and is itself a later form than the Wyandot. It will be equally evident that the Tuscarora, though closely allied to the Mohawk, is rather a sister than a daughter language. It is clear that the separation of the Tuscaroras from the proper Iroquois took place in early times, and that each language has since pursued its own course of development,—that of the Iroquois in their chosen abode along the Mohawk River, and that of the Tuscaroras in their southern asylum, between the Roanoke and the Alleghany Mountains.

Following the same course of migration from the northeast to the southwest, which leads us from the Hurons of eastern Canada to the Tuscaroras of central North Carolina, we come to the Cherokees of northern Alabama and Georgia. A connection between their language and that of the Iroquois has long been suspected. Gallatin, in his "Synopsis of Indian Languages," remarks on this subject: "Dr. Barton thought that the Cherokee language belonged to the Iroquois family, and on this point I am inclined to be of the same opinion. The affinities are few and remote, but there is a similarity in the general termination of syllables, in the pronunciation and accent, which has struck some of the native Cherokees. We have not a sufficient knowledge of the grammar, and generally of the language, of the Five Nations to decide that question."

The difficulty arising from this lack of knowledge is now removed; and with it all uncertainty disappears. The similarity of the two tongues, apparent enough in many of their words, is most strikingly shown, as might be expected, in their grammatical structure, and especially in the affixed pronouns, which in both languages play so important a part. The resemblance may, perhaps, best be shown by giving the pronouns in the form in which they are combined with a suffixed syllable to render the meaning expressed by the English *self* or *alone*,—"I myself," or "I alone," &c.

	IROQUOIS.	CHEROKEE.
I alone	<i>akoñhāa</i>	<i>akwũñsũñ</i>
Thou alone	<i>soñhāa</i>	<i>tsũñsũñ</i>
He alone	<i>raoñhāa (haoñhāa)</i>	<i>uwasũñ</i>
We two alone	<i>onkiuoñhaũ</i>	<i>ginũñsũñ</i>
Ye two alone	<i>senoñhāa (Huron, stoñhaa)</i>	<i>istũñsũñ</i>
We alone (pl.)	<i>onkiõñhāa</i>	<i>ikũñsũñ</i>
Ye alone	<i>tsioñhāa (Huron, tsonhaa)</i>	<i>itsũñsũñ</i>
They alone	<i>ronoñhaũ (honoñhāa)</i>	<i>unũñsũñ</i>

If from the foregoing list we omit the terminal suffixes *hāa* and *sũñ*, which differ in the two languages, the close resemblance of the prefixed pronouns is apparent. Equally evident is the fact that the Cherokee pronouns, particularly in the third person singular and plural, and in the first person dual and plural, are softened and contracted forms of the Iroquois pronouns.

To form the verbal transitions, as they are termed, in which the action of a transitive verb passes from an agent to an object, both languages prefix the pronouns, in a combined form, to the verb, saying, "I-thee love," "thou-me lovest," and the like. These combined pronouns are similar in the two languages, as the following examples will show:

	IROQUOIS.	CHEROKEE.
I-thee	<i>koñ</i> or <i>koñyc</i>	<i>guñya</i>
I-him	<i>ria, hia</i>	<i>tsiya</i>
He-me	<i>raka, haka</i>	<i>akwa</i>
He-us	<i>soñkwa</i>	<i>teawka</i>
Thou-him	<i>hia</i>	<i>hiya</i>
Thou-them	<i>s'hcia</i>	<i>tegihya</i>
They-me	<i>roñke, hoñke</i>	<i>guñkwa</i>
They-us	<i>yoñke</i>	<i>teyawka</i>

The following list will show the similarity in other words of common occurrence:

	IROQUOIS.	CHEROKEE.
Woman	<i>yuñgwec, yeoñ (Seneca)</i>	<i>ageyũñ</i>
Boy	<i>haksāa</i>	<i>atsatsa</i>
Girl	<i>yiksāa</i>	<i>ayayutsa</i>
Fire	<i>otsile</i>	<i>atsilũñ</i>
Water	<i>awcñ</i>	<i>ama</i>
Lake	<i>uniatale</i>	<i>uñdale</i>
Stone	<i>onoñya</i>	<i>nũñya</i>
Sky	<i>kaloñhia</i>	<i>galũñloi</i>
Arrow	<i>ka'na'</i>	<i>gane</i>
Pipe	<i>kanuñnawa</i>	<i>ganũñnawa</i>
Beaver	<i>tsutayi (Huron)</i>	<i>tawyi</i>
Great	<i>koza</i>	<i>ekwa</i>
Old	<i>akayoñ</i>	<i>ogayũñli</i>

The resemblance in most cases is here so great that the doubt which has existed as to the connection of the two languages may seem unaccountable. It must be stated, however, that these words are selected from a much larger list of vocables, in most of which the resemblance is not apparent. In some of them it exists, but greatly disguised by singular distortions of pronunciation, while in others the Cherokee words differ utterly from those of the Huron-Iroquois languages, and are apparently derived from a different source. There seems, in fact, to be no doubt that the Cherokee is a mixed language, in which, as is usual in such languages, the grammatical skeleton belongs to one stock, while many of the words are supplied by another. As is usual, also, in mixed languages, a change in the phonology of the language has taken place. A language which two races combine to speak must be such as the vocal organs of both can readily pronounce. In the Huron-Iroquois dialects syllables frequently end with a consonant. In the Cherokee every syllable terminates either in a vowel or in a nasal sound. In Iroquois, for example, five is *wisk*; in Cherokee it becomes *hiski*, a word which in their pronunciation is divided *hi-ski*. The Iroquois *raksot* or *haksut*, grandfather, is in Cherokee softened and lengthened to *ctutu*. The probable, or at least possible, cause of this mixture, and the source from which the exotic element of the language may have been derived, will be hereafter considered. Meanwhile, the striking fact has become evident that the course of migration of the Huron-Cherokee family has been from the northeast to the southwest, that is, from eastern Canada, on the Lower St. Lawrence, to the mountains of Northern Alabama.

Another important linguistic stock is that which is known as the Dakotan family, from the native name of the group or confederacy called by the French missionaries and travellers the Sioux. This family occupies a vast extent of country between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains, and comprises many distinct communities, speaking allied though sometimes widely different languages. Among them are the proper Dakotas (including the Assiniboins), the Omahas, Osages, Kansas, Otos, Missouris, Iowas, Mandans, Hidatsas or Minnetarees, and several others. A single tribe, the Winnebagoes, speaking a peculiarly harsh and difficult language, dwelt east of the Mississippi, along the western shore of Lake Michigan; but they were commonly regarded by ethnologists as an offshoot of the prairie tribes, and as intruders into the territory of the Algonkins. Recent investigations, however, have disclosed the remarkable fact that tribes belonging to this family lived in early times east of the Alleghanies, and were found by

the first explorers not far from the Atlantic coast. The travellers who met with them, incurious in such matters, did not take the trouble to record the language spoken by these tribes; and until recently they have been ranked by writers on Indian ethnology among the southern members of the Huron-Iroquois family. In 1870 the last survivor of one of these tribes was still living, at a great age, on the Reserve of the Six Nations, near Brantford. His people, the Tuteloes, who, with several allied tribes, had formerly dwelt in southern Virginia and eastern North Carolina, had been driven from those regions early in the eighteenth century by the white settlers. Like their neighbors, the Tuscaroras, they had fled for refuge to the Iroquois, whom they accompanied in their subsequent flight into Canada. A vocabulary which I took down from his lips showed beyond question that his people belonged to the Dakotan stock. From him, and after his death from some intelligent Indians of mixed race—who, as children of Iroquois fathers by Tutelo mothers, still rank as Tuteloes, and speak the language fluently,—I obtained a sufficient knowledge of this speech to enable me to compare it, not merely in its phonology and its vocabulary, but also in its grammatical structure, with the Dakotan languages spoken west of the Mississippi, so far as these are known, and more particularly with the language of the proper Dakotas (or Sioux) and the Hidatsa, or Minnetarees. These two languages have been carefully studied by able and philosophic investigators, the Rev. Stephen R. Riggs and Dr. Washington Matthews, whose works are models of clear and thorough exposition. The result of this comparison has been a conviction that the Tutelo language is undoubtedly the oldest form of speech thus far known in this family, and that, so far as a judgment can be deduced from this evidence, the course of emigration must be considered to have been from east to west. The fact that the western members of this linguistic family were by far the most numerous counts for nothing in such an inquiry. If mere numbers and extent of territory are to be deemed of any value in questions of this nature, we should have to derive the Polynesians from New Zealand, the Portuguese from Brazil, and the English from North America.

The following list of words will show how the Tutelo vocables become contracted and distorted in the western Dakota speech:

	TUTELO.	DAKOTA.
Blood	<i>wáyi</i>	<i>wc</i>
Knife	<i>masáñi</i>	<i>isañ</i>
Day	<i>niháñpi</i>	<i>añpetu</i>
Water	<i>máni</i>	<i>mini</i>
Land	<i>amáñi</i>	<i>maka</i>

	TUTELO.	DAKOTA.
Winter	<i>wanéñi</i>	<i>wani</i>
Autumn	<i>táñi</i>	<i>ptañ</i>
White	<i>asúñi</i>	<i>sañ</i>
Black	<i>asépi</i>	<i>sapa</i>
Cold	<i>síni</i>	<i>sni</i>
One	<i>nóñsa</i>	<i>wantsha</i>
Three	<i>lúni</i>	<i>yamni</i>
Five	<i>kisaháñi</i>	<i>zaptañ</i>
Six	<i>akáspc</i>	<i>shakpc</i>
Seven	<i>ságomiñk</i>	<i>shakorwiñ</i>

The clearest evidence, however, is to be found in a comparison of the grammatical characteristics. It is an established law in the science of linguistics that, in any family of languages, those which are of the oldest formation,—or, in other words, which approach nearest to the mother speech,—are the most highly inflected. The derivative or more recent tongues are distinguished by the comparative fewness of the grammatical changes. The difference in this respect between the Tutelo and the western branches of this stock is so great that they seem to belong to different categories, or genera, in the classification of languages. The Tutelo may fairly be ranked among inflected tongues, while the Dakota, the Hidatsa, and apparently all the other western dialects of the stock, must rather be classed with agglutinated languages,—the variations of person, number, mood and tense being chiefly denoted by affixed or inserted particles. This statement applies more particularly to the Hidatsa. In the Dakota some remnants of the inflected forms still remain.

Thus, in the Hidatsa there is no difference, in the present tense, between the singular and the plural of the verb. In this language, also, there is no mark of any kind, even by affixed particles, to distinguish the present tense from the past, nor even, in the third person, to distinguish the future from the other tenses. *Kidéçi* may signify "he loves," "he loved," and "he will love." The Dakota is a little better furnished in this way. The plural is distinguished from the singular by the addition of the particle *pi*, and in the first person by prefixing the pronoun *nñ*, they, in lieu of *wa* or *we*, I. Thus, *kaçká*, he binds, becomes *kaçkápi*, they bind; *wakáçka*, I bind, becomes *nñkáçkapi*, we bind. No distinction is made between the present and the past tense. *Kaçká* is both "he binds" and "he bound." The particle *ka*, which is not printed, and apparently not pronounced, as an affix, indicates the future. All other distinctions of number and tense are expressed in these two languages by adverbs, or by the general context of the sentence.

In lieu of these scant and imperfect modes of expression, the Tutelo gives us a surprising wealth of verbal forms. The distinction of singular and plural is clearly shown in all the persons, thus:

<i>opéwa</i> , he goes	<i>opchéhla</i> , they go
<i>oyapéwa</i> , thou goest	<i>oyapépüa</i> , ye go
<i>owapéwa</i> , I go	<i>maopéwa</i> , we go

Of tenses there are many forms. The termination in *ewa* appears to be of an aorist or rather of an indefinite meaning. *Opéwa* (from *opa*, to go), may signify both "he goes," and "he went." A distinctive present is indicated by the termination *ōma*, a distinctive past by *ōka*, and a future by *ta* or *ēta*. Thus from *kte*, to kill, we have *waktēwa*, I kill him, or I killed him, *waktēōma*, I am killing him, and *waktēta*, I shall kill him. So *ohūta*, he sees it, becomes *ohatiōka*, he saw it formerly, and *ohatēta*, he will see it. The inflections for person and number in the distinctively present tense, ending with *oma*, are shown in the following example:

<i>waginōma</i> , he is sick	<i>waginōnhua</i> , they are sick
<i>wayinginōma</i> , thou art sick	<i>wayinginōmpo</i> , ye are sick
<i>wamcginōma</i> , I am sick	<i>mañgwaginōma</i> , we are sick

Besides these inflections for person, number and tense, the Tutelo has also other forms or moods of the verb, negative, interrogative, desiderative, and the like. *Waktēwa*, I killed him, becomes in the negative form *kīwaktēna*, I did not kill him. *Yaktēwa*, thou killedst him, makes in the interrogative form *yaktēwo*, didst thou kill him? *Owapēwa*, I go, shows the combined negative and desiderative forms in *kowapēbina*, I do not wish to go. None of these forms are found in the Dakota or Hidatsa verbs.

In like manner the possessive pronouns, when combined with the noun, show a much greater fulness, and, so to speak, completeness, in the Tutelo than in the Dakota, as is seen in the following example:

	TUTELO.	DAKOTA.
Head	<i>pasūi</i>	<i>pa</i>
My head	<i>mīmpasūi</i>	<i>mapa</i>
Thy head	<i>yīñpasūi</i>	<i>nīpa</i>
His head	<i>cpasūi</i>	<i>pa</i>
Our heads	<i>emañkpasūi</i>	<i>uñpapi</i>
Your heads	<i>eyīñkpasūpui</i>	<i>nīpapi</i>
Their heads	<i>cpasūi-lei</i>	<i>papi</i>

The linguistic evidence is to a certain extent supplemented by other testimony. It would seem at least probable that some of the western Dakotas at one time had their habitations

east of the Mississippi, and have been gradually withdrawing to the westward. The French missionary Gravier, in his "Relation" of the year 1700, affirms that the Ohio River was called by the Illinois and the Miamis the Akansa River, because the Akansas formerly dwelt along it. The Akansas were the Dakota tribe who have given their name to the River and State of Arkansas. Catlin found reason for believing that the Mandans, another tribe of the southern Dakota stock, formerly resided in the valley of the Ohio. The peculiar traces in the soil which marked the foundations of their dwellings and the position of their villages were evident, he affirms, at various points along that river.*

Another very widely extended Indian stock is the Algonkin family, which possessed the Atlantic coast from Labrador to South Carolina, and extended westward to the Mississippi, and even, in the far north, to the Rocky Mountains, where some of the Satsika or Blackfoot tribes speak a corrupt dialect of this stock. Gallatin, who had studied their languages with special care, expresses the opinion (in his "Synopsis of the Indian Tribes," p. 29), that the northern Algonkins were probably the original stock of this family. In this northern division he includes the tribes dwelling north of the Great Lakes, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the vicinity of the northern Dakotas and Blackfoot Indians. They comprise the numerous and widely scattered Montagnais (or Mountaineers), the Algonquins proper, the Ottawas, Chippeways, and Crees or Knistenaux. Whether they were really the elder branch, and whether the Micmacs of Nova Scotia, the Abenakis of Maine, the New England Indians, the Delawares, the Shawanoes, the Miamis, and the other southern and western Algonkins spoke derived or secondary languages, is a question which can only be decided by a careful comparison of words and grammatical forms. Mr. Trumbull, who has made this department of American linguistics peculiarly his own, would be better able than any one else to prosecute this line of research, and decide how far the opinion of Gallatin is sustained by the evidence of language. I may merely remark that in his valuable paper "On Algonkin Versions of the Lord's Prayer," in the Transactions

*After this paper was composed, I had the satisfaction of learning, at the meeting of the American Association in Montreal, from my friend the Rev. J. Owen Dorsey, of the Smithsonian Institution (who has spent several years among the western Dakota tribes in missionary labors, and in investigating their languages and social systems), that all the southern tribes of that stock—the Omahas, Otoes, Kansas, Iowas, Missouris, &c.—have a distinct tradition that their ancestors formerly dwelt east of the Mississippi. Miss Alice C. Fletcher, who had resided for a year among the Omahas, acquiring a knowledge of their customs and traditions, had heard the same history. Whether the northern Dakotas have a similar tradition is not known. The former tribes all speak of the Winnebago (or Hotch-angara) tribe as their uncle, and declare that their own tribes were originally offshoots from the Winnebagoes. A comparison of the letter-changes between the Winnebago and the western dialects (as shown in an interesting paper on the subject read by Mr. Dorsey before the Association), left no doubt of this derivation. The Winnebagoes evidently hold the same relation to the western tribes of this stock that the Mohawks bear to the western

of the American Philological Association for 1872, Mr. Trumbull notices specially the soft and musical character of the languages spoken by the western Algonkins, the Illinois and Miami tribes,—a softness arising from the fact that “the proportion of consonants to vowels in the written language is very small. Some words (he continues) are framed entirely of vowels, e. g., *uaina*, ‘he goes astray;’ *uani*, or, with imperfect diphthongs, *ua-ui*, ‘an egg;’ *uiua*, ‘he is married;’ in many others there is only a single semi-vowel or consonant proper in half-a-dozen syllables, e. g., *äinaakini*, ‘there is yet room;’ *äiäpia*, ‘a buck.’ In *acuenatcuc*, ‘it leans, is not upright,’ we have but two consonants.”

This paucity of consonants is a well-known mark of that phonetic decay which distinguishes derivative languages. The Hawaiian is one of the youngest of the Polynesian dialects. The “Vocabulary” of this language, compiled by the Rev. Lorrin Andrews, shows many hundred words composed either of vowels alone, or of vowels with but a single consonant. *Aoaao*, the sea-breeze, *oiäio*, truth, *uiio*, to question, *hoöicic*, proud, *mauanuwa*, to trade, *uiiiki*, to glimmer, are words which may be compared with those quoted by Mr. Trumbull. Examples might also be drawn from our own speech, in which the German *auge* becomes *eye*, the German *legen* becomes *lay*, the German *machtig* becomes *mighty*, and so on, in numerous instances too well known to need recital. That the Algonkin languages of the Atlantic coast, which, if not harsh, are certainly hard and firm, abounding in consonants, should prove to be of more recent origin than the soft vocalic dialects of the west, is extremely improbable.

The traditions of the northern Algonkins do not, according to the native historians, Peter Jones and George Copway, trace their origin further back than to a comparatively late period, when their ancestors possessed the country which they still hold north of Lakes Huron and Superior. The Crees, from time immemorial, have wandered over the wide region extending between these lakes and Hudson's Bay, and stretching eastward to the coast of southern Labrador. It is only in recent times, as the Rev. Father Lacombe, the author of an excellent dictionary and grammar of their language, assures us, that they have found their way west of the Red River, and have expelled the Assiniboins and the Blackfoot tribes from a por-

Iroquois nations, while the Tuteloës are to the Winnebagoes what the Hurons are to the Mohawks. That the emigration of the Dakota tribes from the east, which was inferred by me (after the discovery of the Tutelo language), from purely linguistic evidence, should be thus confirmed, must be regarded as a striking proof of the value of such evidence in ethnological science. It is gratifying to know that through the well-directed efforts of Major Powell and his able collaborators, the students of this science, in its American department, will soon have a large mass of valuable evidence at their command, in the publications of the Smithsonian Bureau of Ethnology.

tion of the territory extending from that river to the Rocky Mountains. The Lenni Lenape, or Delawares, alone possessed what seems to have been a genuine tradition, going back for many generations. Of this tradition some further notice will hereafter be taken.

The southern region of the United States, extending from the eastern coast of Georgia to the Mississippi River, was occupied chiefly by a fourth linguistic stock, the Chahta-Muskoki family, comprising the Creeks or Muskhogees, the Chickasas, the Choctaws, and some minor tribes. The language of the easternmost of these, the Creeks, differs so widely from those of the western tribes, the Choctaws and Chickasas, that Gallatin, though noticing resemblances sufficient to incline him to believe in their common origin, felt obliged to classify them as belonging to separate stocks. Later investigations leave no doubt of their affinity. The differences, however, are much greater than those which exist between the different languages of the Algonkin family, or between those of the Huron-Iroquois group. They may rather be compared with the differences which are found between the Cherokee and the Iroquois languages. There is an evident grammatical resemblance, along with a marked unlikeness in a considerable portion of the vocabulary. The natural inference, as in the case of the Cherokee, is that many of the words of these differing languages have been derived from some foreign source. This is the opinion expressed by Dr. D. G. Brinton, than whom no higher authority on this point can be adduced, in his interesting paper "On the National Legend of the Chahta-Muskokee Indians," published in the *Historical Magazine* for February, 1870. It has seemed to me not unlikely that these languages and the Cherokee owed the foreign element of their vocabulary to the same source, and that this source was the language of the people who formerly occupied the central region of the United States, and who have been the object of so much painstaking investigation, under the name of "The Mound-builders."

The mystery which so long enveloped the character and fate of this vanished people is gradually disappearing before the persistent inquiries of archæologists. The late lamented President of our Association, the Hon. L. H. Morgan, in his work on the "Houses and House-Life of the American Aborigines," has shown the evidences of resemblance in the mode of life and social condition of the Moundbuilders to those of the "Village Indians" of New Mexico and Arizona. From various indications, however, it would seem probable that their political system had been further developed than that of these Village

Indians, and that, as in the Mexican Valley and in Peru, the greater portion of the population was combined under one central authority. Dr. Brinton, in a well-reasoned essay on "The Probable Nationality of the Moundbuilders," printed in the *AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN* for October, 1881, has pointed out the fact that the tribes of the Chahta-Muskoki family were mound-builders in recent times, and that their structures were but little inferior in size to those of the extinct population of the Ohio Valley. He sees reason for concluding that "the Moundbuilders of the Ohio were in part the progenitors of the Chahta tribes." Dr. Brinton's extensive research and his caution in deciding give great weight to his conclusions, to which I would only venture to suggest some modifications drawn from the evidences of tradition and language.

Mr. Morgan remarks that "from the absence of all traditional knowledge of the Moundbuilders among the tribes found east of the Mississippi, an inference arises that the period of their occupation was ancient." For the same reason he thinks it probable that their withdrawal was gradual and voluntary; for "if their expulsion had been the result of protracted warfare, all remembrance of so remarkable an event would scarcely have been lost among the tribes by whom they were displaced." Mr. Morgan's profound studies in sociology left him apparently little time to devote to the languages and traditions of the Indians; otherwise he could not have failed to notice that the memories retained by them of the overthrow and expulsion of their semi-civilized predecessors are remarkably full and distinct. We have these traditions recorded by two native authorities, the one Iroquois, the other Algonkin, each ignorant of the other's existence, and yet each confirming the other with singular exactness.

The remarkable historical work of the Tuscarora Cusick, owing to its confused and childish style, and its absurd chronology, has received far less attention than its intrinsic value deserves. Whenever his statements can be submitted to the test of language, they are invariably confirmed. He tells us that in ancient times, before the Iroquois separated from the Hurons, "the northern nations formed a confederacy, and seated a great council-fire on the River St. Lawrence." This confederacy appointed a high chief ("a prince," as Cusick calls him), as ambassador, who "immediately repaired to the south, and visited the great emperor, who resided at the Golden City, a capital of the vast empire." The mention of the Golden City has probably induced many readers of Cusick's book to relegate this story to the cloudland of mythology. But it must be remembered that to the Indians of North America one metal was as remarkable and as precious as another. Copper was, in fact,

their gold. Among the Moundbuilders, copper held the precise place which gold held in ancient Peru. Of hammered copper they made ornaments for their persons and their dresses, and wrought their most valued implements. In one grave-mound in Athens county, Ohio, Professor E. B. Andrews found about five hundred copper beads, forming a line around the space which had once held the body of the former owner. "When we remember (he writes) that the copper of the Moundbuilders was obtained from the veins of native copper near Lake Superior (a long way off from southern Ohio), where it was quarried in the most laborious manner; that it was hammered into thin sheets, and divided into narrow strips, by no better smith's tools, so far as we know, than such as could be made of stone, and then rolled into beads, it is evident that the aggregate amount of labor involved in the fabrication of the beads in this mound would give them an immense value."*

Cusick's "Golden City" was probably a city abounding in the precious red metal of the Lake Superior mines. "After a time," he proceeds, "the emperor built many forts throughout his dominions, and almost penetrated to Lake Erie. This produced an excitement. The people of the north felt that they would soon be deprived of the country on the south side of the Great Lakes. They determined to defend their country against the infringement of foreign people. Long, bloody wars ensued, which, perhaps, lasted about one hundred years. The people of the north were too skilful in the use of bows and arrows, and could endure hardships which proved fatal to a foreign people. At last the northern people gained the conquest, and all the towns and forts were totally destroyed, and left in a heap of ruins."

This tells the whole story, in the plainest language. There is not the slightest reason for supposing that this narrative is a fabrication. If it were, it would be the only discoverable invention in the book. But Cusick's work bears throughout the stamp of perfect sincerity. There is nothing in it drawn from books, or, so far as can be discovered, from any other source than native tradition. His story, moreover, receives confirmation, as has been said, from an independent and even hostile quarter. The Delaware Indians, who styled themselves Lenni Lenape, had a tradition closely agreeing with that of the Iroquois. This, too, has been overlooked or undervalued, through a manifest geographical error in those who first received and attempted to interpret it,—the error of supposing

*Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archeology and Ethnology for 1880, p. 61.

that only one river could bear among the Indians the very common name of the "great river."

The well-known missionary author, Heckewelder, commences his "History of the Indian Nations," with the account which the Lenni Lenape give of the migrations that brought them to the region on the banks of the Delaware River, where they were found by the white colonists. The story, as he relates it, is entirely credible, and corresponds with the Iroquois traditions, except in one respect. The Lenape and the Iroquois are represented as coming not from the north, but from the far west, crossing "the Mississippi" together, and falling with their united forces on the people whom they found in the Ohio valley. These were a numerous people, called the Allighewi or Tallegwi, who dwelt in great fortified towns. After a long and destructive war, in which no quarter was given, the Allighewi were utterly defeated, and fled "down the Mississippi." The conquerors then divided the country between them, the Iroquois choosing the region along the Great Lakes, while the Lenape took possession of the country further south. The tradition is recorded at much greater length, and with many additional particulars, in a paper on the "Historical and Mythological Traditions of the Algonquins," by the distinguished archæologist, E. G. Squier, read before the Historical Society of New York, in June, 1848, and republished lately by Mr. Beach in his "Indian Miscellany." This paper comprises a translation of the *Walum-Olum*, or "bark-record" of the Lenni Lenape, a genuine Indian composition, in the Delaware language. It is evidently a late compilation, in which Indian traditions are mingled with notions drawn from missionary teachings. The purely historical part has, like Cusick's narrative, an authentic air, and corrects some errors in the minor details of Heckewelder's summary. The country from which the Lenape migrated was *Shinaki*, the "land of fir-trees," not in the west, but in the far north,—evidently the woody region north of Lake Superior. The people who joined them in the war against the Allighewi (or Tallegwi, as they are called in this record), were the Talamatan, a name meaning "not of themselves," whom Mr. Squier identifies with the Hurons, and no doubt correctly, if we understand by this name the Huron-Iroquois people, as they existed before their separation. The river which they crossed was the Messusipu, the "Great River," beyond which the Tallegwi were found, "possessing the east." That this river was not our Mississippi is evident from the fact that the works of the Moundbuilders extended far to the westward of the latter river, and would have been encountered by the invading nations, if they had approached it from the west,

long before they arrived at its banks. The "Great River" was apparently the upper St. Lawrence, and most probably that portion of it which flows from Lake Huron to Lake Erie, and which is commonly known as the Detroit River. Near this river, according to Heckewelder, at a point west of Lake St. Clair, and also at another place just south of Lake Erie, some desperate conflicts took place. Hundreds of the slain Tallegwi, as he was told, were buried under mounds in that vicinity. This precisely accords with Cusick's statement that the people of the great southern empire had "almost penetrated to Lake Erie" at the time when the war began. Of course, in coming to the Detroit River from the region north of Lake Superior, the Algonkins would be advancing from the west to the east. It is quite conceivable that, after many generations and many wanderings, they may themselves have forgotten which was the true Messusipu, or Great River, of their traditionary tales.

The passage already quoted from Cusick's narrative informs us that the contest lasted "perhaps one hundred years." In close agreement with this statement, the Delaware record makes it endure during the terms of four head-chiefs, who in succession presided in the Lenape councils. From what we know historically of Indian customs, the average tenure of such chiefs may be computed at about twenty-five years. The following extract from the record gives their names and probably the fullest account of the conflict which we shall ever possess :

"Some went to the east, and the Tallegwi killed a portion ;

Then all of one mind exclaimed, War ! War !

The Talamatan (not-of-themselves) and the Nitilowan, [allied north-people], go united (to the war.)

Kinnepehend (Sharp-looking) was the leader, and they went over the river, And they took all that was there, and despoiled and slew the Tallegwi.

Pimokhasuwi (Stirring-about) was next chief, and then the Tallegwi were much too strong.

Tenckkensit (Open-path) followed, and many towns were given up to him.

Paganchihilla was chief, and the Tallegwi all went southward.

South of the Lakes they (the Lenape) settled their council-fire, and north of the Lakes were their friends the Talamatan (Hurons?)

There can be no reasonable doubt that the Allighewi or Tallegwi, who have given their name to the Alleghany River and Mountains, were the Moundbuilders. It is also evident that in their overthrow the incidents of the fall of the Roman Empire were in a rude way repeated. The destiny which ultimately befell the Moundbuilders can be inferred from what we know of the fate of the Hurons themselves in their final war with the Iroquois. The lamentable story recorded in the Jesuit "Relations," and in the vivid narrative of Parkman, is

well known. The greater portion of the Huron people were exterminated, and their towns reduced to ashes. Of the survivors many were received and adopted among the conquerors. A few fled to the east and sought protection from the French, while a larger remnant retired to the northwest, and took shelter among the friendly Ojibways. The fate of the Tallegwi was doubtless similar to that which thus overtook the descendants of their Huron conquerors. So long as the conflict continued, it was a war of extermination. All the conquered were massacred, and all that was perishable in their towns was destroyed. When they finally yielded, many of the captives would be spared to recruit the thinned ranks of their conquerors. This, at least, would occur among that division of the conquering allies which belonged to the Huron-Iroquois race; for such adoption of defeated enemies is one of the ancient and cardinal principles of their well-devised political system. It is by no means unlikely that a portion of the Moundbuilders may, during the conflict, have separated from the rest and deliberately united their destiny with those of the conquering race, as the Tlascalans joined the Spaniards in their war against the Aztecs. Either in such an alliance or in the adoption of captive enemies, we may discern the origin of the great Cherokee nation, a people who were found occupying the southeastern district of the Moundbuilders' country, having their chief council-house on the summit of a vast mound which they themselves ascribed to a people who preceded them,* and speaking a language which shows evident traces of its mixed origin,—in grammar mainly Huron-Iroquois, and in vocabulary largely recruited from some foreign source.

Another portion of the defeated race, fleeing southward "down the Mississippi," would come directly to the country of the Chahta, or Choctaws, themselves (as Dr. Brinton reminds us) a mound-building people, inferior probably in civilization to the Allighewi, but superior, it may be, in warlike energy. With these the northern conquerors would have no quarrel, and the remnant of the Allighewi would be allowed to remain in peace among their protectors, and, becoming incorporated with them, would cause that change in their language which makes the speech of the Choctaws differ as much from that of their eastern kindred, the Creeks or Muskhokees, as the speech of the Cherokees differs from that of their northern congeners, the Iroquois.

If this theory is correct, we might expect to find some similar words in the languages of the Cherokees and the Choctaws. These languages, so far as their grammar is concerned,

* Bartram's Travels, p. 367. Reports of the Peabody Museum, vol. 2, p. 76.

belong to entirely different stocks. The difference is as complete as that which exists between the Persian and Turkish languages. It is well known that these last-named languages, though utterly unlike in grammar, have a common element in the Arabic words which each has adopted from a neighboring race. We are naturally led to inquire whether similar traces exist in the Cherokee and the Choctaw of a common element derived from some alien source. The comparative vocabularies given in Gallatin's work comprise chiefly those primitive and essential words which are rarely borrowed by any language, such as the ordinary terms of relationship, the names of the parts of the human body and the most common natural objects, the numerals, and similar terms. There are, however, some words, such as the terms for some articles of attire, the names of certain animals, and a few others, which in most languages are occasionally taken from a foreign source. Thus the Saxon-English has borrowed from the Norman-French element the words for boot and coat, for cattle and squirrel, for prisoner and metal. It is, therefore, interesting to find that the vocabularies of the Cherokee and the Choctaw, differing in all the more common words, show an evident similarity in the following list:

	CHEROKEE	CHOCTAW and CHICASA
Shoes	<i>lasulo</i>	<i>shulush</i>
Buffalo	<i>yanasa</i>	<i>hüunnüşh, yennush</i>
Fox	<i>tsula</i>	<i>chula</i>
Prisoner	<i>ayun̄ki</i>	<i>yuka</i>
Metal	<i>atclun</i>	<i>tülle, toli</i>

These resemblances, occurring only in words of this peculiar class, can hardly be mere coincidences. A more extensive and minute comparison will be needed to establish beyond question the existence of this foreign element common to the two languages, and the extent to which each has been modified by it; but the indications thus shown seem to confirm the conclusions derived from the clear and positive traditions of the northern Indians. Every known fact favors the view that during a period which may be roughly estimated at between one and two thousand years ago, the Ohio valley was occupied by an industrious population of some Indian stock, which had attained a grade of civilization similar to that now held by the Village Indians of New Mexico and Arizona; that this population was assailed from the north by less civilized and more warlike tribes of Algonkins and Hurons, acting in a temporary league, similar to those alliances which Pontiac and Tecumseh

afterwards rallied against the white colonists; that after a long and wasting war the assailants were victorious; the conquered people were in great part exterminated; the survivors were either incorporated with the conquering tribes or fled southward and found a refuge among the nations which possessed the region lying between the Ohio valley and the Gulf of Mexico; and that this mixture of races has largely modified the language, character, and usages of the Cherokee and Choctaw nations.*

It will be noticed that the evidence of language, and to some extent that of tradition, leads to the conclusion that the course of migration of the Indian tribes has been from the Atlantic coast westward and southward. The Huron-Iroquois tribes had their pristine seat on the lower St. Lawrence. The traditions of the Algonkins seem to point to Hudson's Bay and the coast of Labrador. The Dakota stock had its oldest branch east of the Alleghanies, and possibly (if the Catawba nation shall be proved to be of that stock), on the Carolina coast. Philologists are well aware that there is nothing in the language of the American Indians to favor the conjecture (for it is nothing else), which derives the race from eastern Asia. But in western Europe one community is known to exist, speaking a language which in its general structure manifests a near likeness to the Indian tongues. Alone of all the races of the old continent the Basques or Euskarians of northern Spain and southwestern France have a speech of that highly complex and polysynthetic character which distinguishes the American languages. There is not, indeed, any such positive similarity in words or grammar as would prove a direct affiliation. The likeness is merely in the general cast and mould of speech; but this likeness is so marked as to have awakened much attention. If the scholars who have noticed it had been aware of the facts now adduced with regard to the course of migration on this continent, they would probably have been led to the conclusion that this similarity in the type of speech was an evidence of the unity of race. There seems reason to believe that Europe,—at least in its southern and western portions,—was occupied in early times by a race having many of the

* I am gratified to find that the views here set forth with regard to the character and fate of the Moundbuilders are almost identical with those expressed by Mr M. E. Force, in his excellent paper, entitled 'To what Race did the Moundbuilders belong?' read before the *Congrès International des Américanistes*, at Luxembourg in 1877. The fact that so judicious and experienced an inquirer as Judge Force, after a personal examination of the earthworks, has arrived, on purely archaeological grounds, at the same conclusions to which I have been brought by the independent evidence of tradition and language, must be regarded as affording strong confirmation of the correctness of these conclusions. Mr. J. P. MacLean, in his valuable work on "the Moundbuilders," shows (p. 141) that the strong and skillfully planned line of fortresses raised by the ancient residents of Ohio was plainly erected against an enemy coming from the north, and that the warfare was evidently a long-protracted struggle, ending suddenly in the complete overthrow and destruction or expulsion of the defenders. These facts coincide exactly with the tradition recorded by Cusick.

characteristics, physical and mental, of the American aborigines. The evidences which lead to this conclusion are well set forth in Dr. Dawson's recent work on "Fossil Man." Of this early European people, by some called the Iberian race, who were ultimately overwhelmed by the Aryan emigrants from central Asia, the Basques are the only survivors that have retained their original language; but all the nations of southern Europe, commencing with the Greeks, show in their physical and mental traits a large intermixture of this aboriginal race. As we advance westward, the evidence of this infusion becomes stronger, until in the Celts of France and of the British Islands, it gives the predominant cast to the character of the people.*

If the early population of Europe were really similar to that of America, then we may infer that it was composed of many tribes, scattered in loose bands over the country, and speaking languages widely and sometimes radically different, but all of a polysynthetic structure. They were a bold, proud, adventurous people, good hunters and good sailors. In the latter respect they were wholly unlike the primitive Aryans, who, as was natural in a pastoral people of inland origin, have always had in the east a terror of the ocean, and in Europe were, within historic times, the clumsiest and least venturesome of navigators. If communities resembling the Iroquois and the Caribs once inhabited the British islands and the western coasts of the adjacent continent, we may be sure that their fleets of large canoes, such as have been exhumed from the peat-deposits and ancient river-beds of Ireland, Scotland, and France, swarmed along all the shores and estuaries of that region. Accident or adventure may easily have carried some of them across the Atlantic, not merely once, but in many successive emigrations from different parts of western Europe. The distance is less than that which the canoes of the Polynesians were accustomed to traverse. The derivation of the American population from this source presents no serious improbability whatever.†

On the theory, which seems thus rendered probable, that the early Europeans were of the same race as the Indians of

*"The Basque may then be the sole surviving relic and witness of an aboriginal western European population, dispossessed by the intrusive Indo-European tribes. It stands entirely alone, no kindred having yet been found for it in any part of the world. It is of an exaggeratedly agglutinative type, incorporating into its verb a variety of relations which are almost everywhere else expressed by an independent word."—"The Basque forms a suitable stepping-stone from which to enter the peculiar linguistic domain of the New World, since there is no other dialect of the Old World which so much resembles in structure the American languages."—Professor Whitney, in *"The Life and Growth of Language,"* p. 258.

†The distance from Ireland to Newfoundland is only sixteen hundred miles. The distance from the Sandwich Islands to Tahiti (whence the natives of the former group affirm that their ancestors came), is twenty-two hundred miles. The distance from the former

America, we are able to account for certain characteristics of the modern nations of Europe, which would otherwise present to the student of anthropology a perplexing problem. The Aryans of Asia, ancient and modern, as we know them in the Hindoos, the Persians, and the Armenians, with the evidence afforded by their history, their literature, and their present condition, have always been utterly devoid of the sentiment of political rights. The love of freedom is a feeling of which they seem incapable. To humble themselves before some superior power,—deity, king, or brahmin,—seems to be with them a natural and overpowering inclination. Next to this feeling is the love of contemplation and of abstract reasoning. A dreamy life of worship and thought is the highest felicity of the Asiatic Aryan. On the other hand, if the ancient Europeans were what the Basques and the American Indians are now, they were a people imbued with the strongest possible sense of personal independence, and, resulting from that, a passion for political freedom. They were also a shrewd, practical, observant people, with little taste for abstract reasoning.

It is easy to see that from a mingling of two races of such opposite dispositions, a people of mixed character would be formed, very similar to that which has existed in Europe since the advent of the Aryan emigrants. In eastern Europe, among the Greeks and Slavonians, where the Iberian element would be weakest, the Aryan characteristics of reverence and contemplation would be most apparent. As we advance westward, among the Latin and Teutonic populations, the sense of political rights, the taste for adventure, and the observing, practical tendency, would be more and more manifest; until at length, among the western Celts, as among the American Indians, the love of freedom would become exalted to an almost morbid distrust of all governing authority.

If this theory is correct, the nations of modern Europe have derived those traits of character and those institutions which have given them their present headship of power and civilization among the peoples of the globe, not from their Aryan forefathers, but mainly from this other portion of their ancestry, belonging to the earlier population which the Aryans overcame and absorbed. That this primitive population was tolerably numerous is evident from the fact that the Aryans, particularly of the Latin, Teutonic, and Celtic nations, lost in absorbing it many vocal elements and many grammatical in-

islands to the Marquesas group, the nearest inhabited land, is seventeen hundred miles. The canoes of the Sandwich Islands (as we are assured by Ellis, in his "Polynesian Researches"), "seldom exceed fifty feet in length." In the river-beds of France, ancient canoes have been found exceeding forty feet in length. One was more than forty-five feet long, and nearly four feet deep. See the particulars in Figuier's "Primitive Man," Appleton's edit., p. 177.

flections of their speech. They gained, at the same time, the self-respect, the love of liberty, and the capacity for self-government, which were unknown to them in their Asiatic home. Knowing that these characteristics have always marked the American race, we need not be surprised when modern researches demonstrate the fact that many of our Indian communities have possessed political systems embodying some of the most valuable principles of popular government. We shall no longer feel inclined to question the truth of the conclusion which has been announced by Carli, Draper, and other philosophic investigators, who affirm that the Spaniards, in their conquest of Mexico, Yucatan, and Peru, destroyed a better form of society than that which they established in its place. The intellectual but servile Aryans will cease to attract the undue admiration which they have received for qualities not their own; and we shall look with a new interest on the remnant of the Indian race, as possibly representing this nobler type of man, whose inextinguishable love of freedom has evoked the idea of political rights, and has created those institutions of regulated self-government by which genuine civilization and progress are assured to the world.

AMERICAN
SANT-SUITE